



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/702,521	10/31/2000	Alexander Sherman		7227

7590

12/16/2003

David H Judson
Assistant General Counsel Intellectual Property
Akamai Technologies Inc
500 Technology Square
Cambridge, MA 02139

EXAMINER

KIANERSI, MITRA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2143

DATE MAILED: 12/16/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/702,521

Applicant(s)

SHERMAN ET AL.

Examiner

mitra kianersi

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Oct 31st 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 October 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2143

Claims 1-12 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim 1-3, 6-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by
Garrity et al. (US. Patent No. 6,230,205).

1. As per claim 1, Garrity et al. teach a method for identifying and removing given content files from a set of content servers in a content delivery network, (server sending a content, col 2, lines 34-35) comprising:

- identifying a set of one or more content files to be removed from the content delivery network; (removing of specified entry, col 9, lines 12-13)

- pushing an aggregate purge request to each of a set of staging servers, each aggregate purge request including an identifier for each content file to be removed from the content delivery network; (push broker manages delivery of contents, col 2, lines 35-37) and

- periodically, having each of the set of content servers obtain the aggregate purge request from a given staging server, (initiation of transmission, col 2, lines 37-44) and

- at each content server, purging from the content server each content file identified in the aggregate purge request. (determining a valid transmission, col 2, lines 44-47)

Art Unit: 2143

2. As per claim 2, Garrity et al. teach a method wherein the aggregate purge request is pushed to the each of the set of staging servers over a secure link. (Fig.2) and (IP security protocol for protection of data transfer, col 4, lines 37-41)

3. As per claim 3, Garrity et al. teach a method wherein the aggregate purge request is pulled from the given staging server to each of the set of content servers over a secure link. (different mechanisms used for the protection of the data transfer, col 4, lines 37-40)

4. As per claim 6, Garrity et al. teach a method wherein the step of identifying the set of one or more content files to be removed from the content delivery network includes the step of verifying that a user requesting removal is authorized to purge the content files. (consumers are verified by user server, col 7, lines 11-12) and (user decides to remove an event, col 9, lines 11-13)

5. As per claim 7, Garrity et al. teach a method wherein the user is a content delivery network customer.(customer profile, col 7, lines 12-13)

6. As per claim 8, Garrity et al. teach a method wherein the user is a content delivery network administrator. (users are referred to as content consumer, col 3, line 38)

7. As per claim 9, Garrity et al. teach a method wherein a third party content is cached on and served from a set of content servers in response to end user requests, comprising a processor; and

-code executable by the processor for receiving purge requests from a plurality of content provider customers, for each purge request, validating a file identifier as being associated with a content file that may be purged from the content delivery network; (validating, col 8, lines 34-37) aggregating into a batch purge request a set of identifiers that have been validated; (determining the status of content consumers, col 7, lines 41-43) issuing the batch purge request to enable purging of the

Art Unit: 2143

content files associated with the validated identifiers. (server removing subscription, col 7, lines 23-28)

8. As per claim 10, Garrity et al. teach a staging server for use in a content delivery network wherein third party content is cached on and served from a set of content servers in response to end user requests, comprising a processor; and

- code executable by the processor for (a) receiving a batch request identifying a set of content files that have been validated to be purged from the content delivery network; and (b) responsive to a poll received from a content server, serving the batch request to the content server to enable purging of the content files. (server 402, for removing a cancelled content, col 7, line 26)

9. As per claim 11, Garrity et al. teach a content delivery network wherein third party content is cached on and served from a set of content servers in response to end user requests, the improvement comprising:

- a purge mechanism for selectively identifying and removing given content files from the set of content servers, comprising

- a Web-based interface for identifying content files to be purged from the content delivery network; (GUI, may be a series of web pages, col 10, lines 33-34)

- a purge server for receiving purge requests pushed from the Web-based interface, validating each purge request, batching a set of purge requests into an aggregate purge request; (server 402 for removing a cancelled content, col 7, line 26)

- a set of staging servers for receiving the aggregate purge request pushed from the purge server; and code executing on a given content server for periodically polling a given staging server for pulling the aggregate purge request, and for removing the identified content files from the content server. (data is encoded by encoder, col 8, lines 20-30) and (col 14, lines 26-30)

10. As per claim 12, Garrity et al. teach a content delivery network wherein the given content server includes code for inhibiting data sharing between the given content

Art Unit: 2143

server and another content server in the content delivery network if a given purge request has already been processed. (authorization of file transfer, col 15, lines 7-13)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garrity et al. (US. Patent No. 6,230,205) and further in view of Dobbins et al. (US 2002/0066033).

11. As per claims 4 and 5, Garrity et al. do not explicitly teach the step of issuing a notification that each content file identified in the aggregate purge request has been purged from the content delivery network and has been accepted for purging. However, Dobbins et al. in Fig. 6, teach a session cancellation by way of a messaging service corresponding to notification of cancellation. (page 3, paragraph [0026])

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ Garrity's idea of managing delivery of multimedia content in a communication system with Dobbins' messaging service in order to improve managing delivery of content to a content consumer and also managing transfer of data within a communications system.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mitra Kianersi whose telephone number is (703) 305-4650. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00AM-4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley can be reached on (703) 308-5221. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 746-9923.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Mitra Kianersi
Dec/10/2003


DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100